## EXHIBIT 2 Deposition of Harri Kytomaa

## In the Matter Of:

HILDA BATES v. TIPPMANN SPORTS, LLC., et al.

## VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF HARRI KYTOMAA

June 19, 2018



1201West Peachtree Street Suite 2300 Atlanta, GA 30309 404.847.0999

- 1 With respect to the 12-ounce bottle, am I 0. 2 correct in understanding that your opinion is 3 that it was last filled by either Mr. Bates or 4 Dick's Sporting Goods on January 6, correct?
  - That's right. Α.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- Do you think that it is likely if Dick Sporting Q. Goods filled those bottles, the 9-ounce can and the 12-ounce can on January 6 that they would both burst or rupture within 24 hours of each other or four weeks later, or is it more likely that Mr. Bates filled them the night before and they burst within 24 hours of him filling them?
- 13 I don't know. Α.
- 14 Why don't you know? 0.
- 15 I think there's too many variables to be able Α. 16 to answer that question.
- 17 Have you undertaken to try to find that answer Ο. 18 out?
- 19 Α. I have not.
- 20 Regardless of who last filled it, do you agree Q. 21 or is it your opinion, to a reasonable degree of 22 engineering certainty, that whoever filled it
- 23 last overfilled it?
- 24 Α. When you say "it" what do you mean?
- 25 The 9-ounce canister. Q.



	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
	5
1	6
1	7
	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4

25

I have not tried to make that determination, but I would say that certainly easy to overfill by accident and while trying to do what the filler thinks is the right thing.

- Q. Have you reached an opinion as to whether if Mr. Bates is the one that overfilled the canister if he did it intentionally?
- A. You're asking me hypothetical. I've already given you my opinions, and I have not tried to answer that question before. I guess I don't have an opinion on that.
- Q. Is it your opinion, to a reasonable degree of engineering certainty, that the overfilled 9-ounce canister was a approximate cause of the rupture of the canister itself?

MS. HOUCK: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

A. The cause of the failure of the canister is the defective PRD. Had the PRD had not been defective, this would have never happened.

In addition -- so essentially what happened here is that there was a combination of both overfilled as well as defective PRD, and that caused the event.

If the canister had been overfilled as it

was with a properly working PRD, this would have never happened. And conversely, if the canister had not been overfilled and the PRD was as it was defective, this also would not have happened. So it required both to be in place.

Q. Let me make sure I understand your answer.

Assuming the PRD is, in your opinion, defective, if whomever filled the 9-ounce tank had not overfilled it, you agree there would not have been a ruptured event; is that correct?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. I assume it's your opinion that the rupture event is what caused Mr. Bates' death?
- A. The rupture of the canister, yes. Let me be clear on that.

That's what the record indicates. I've not tried to independently determine either anything associated with the medical record or anything that would suggest in dispute the fact that the canister ruptured. Those are the facts in the case. I accept those as they are.

Q. As you sit here today, it's fair to say that if this 9-ounce canister had not been overfilled, Mr. Bates would not have died in the manner he did; is that correct?